A Comparison of Communication Verbs Used by Turkish EFL Learners and English Native Speakers: A Corpus Based Study

Yabanci Dil Olarak İngilizce Öğrenen Türk Öğrenciler ve Anadil Olarak İngilizce Konuşanlar Tarafından Kullanılan İletişim Eylemlerinin Bir Karşılaştırması: Derlem Tabanlı Bir Çalışma

Fatih Ünal BOZDAĞ[*]
Nebahat BADEM[**]

Abstract

This study investigates a certain set of semantically categorized verbs, namely Communication Verbs (CV) (Biber, 2006) in learner language. Communication verbs are "a special subcategory of activity verbs that involve communication activities" (2006, p. 247) and they are relatively common both in written and spoken discourse. Two corpora, LOCNESS and TICLE, were analysed to reveal frequencies of these verbs in both corpora and the findings showed that though priming of most frequent verbs in each corpus are identical, Turkish EFL learners significantly underused such verbs in their argumentative essays. In-depth analysis additionally signified distinctive grammatical patterns as well as various semantic frames of nouns collocated with verbs selected in TICLE. Finally, based on the findings, usage based differences were examined and the reasons why learners might have used particular patterns in comparison to the ones used by NSs, were suggested by making references to Hunston and Francis's Pattern Grammar (2000).

Keywords: Communication Verbs, Learner Corpus, Interlanguage, Pattern Grammar

Öz

Bu çalışma, anlamsal olarak sınıflandırılmış eylemleri, özellikle İletişim Eylemlerini (Communication Verbs) (Biber, 2006) öğrenci dilinde incelemektedir. İletişim eylemleri, "iletişim etkinliklerini içeren etkinlik eylemlerinin özel bir alt sınıfıdır" (2006, s.247) ve hem yazılı hem de sözlü söylemde nispeten yaygındır. İki derlem, LOCNESS ve TICLE, bu eylemlerin iki derlemdeki sıklıklarını ortaya koymak için incelendi ve bulgular her bir derlemdeki en sık eylemlerin öne çıkartılma durumları benzer olmasına rağmen, yabancı dil olarak İngilizce öğrenen Türk öğrencilerin, bu eylemleri kompozisyonlarında önemli ölçüde daha az kullandığını gösterdi. Derinlemesine inceleme sonuçları ek olarak, TICLE'da seçilen eylemlerin ad eşdizimliliklerinin , çeşitli anlamsal çerçevelerin yanı sıra, ayırt edici dilbilgisel örüntüleri belirtilmiştir. Son olarak, elde edilen bulgulara dayanarak, kullanıma dayalı farklılıklar incelendi ve öğrencilerin anadil olarak İngilizce konuşan kişilere kıyasla, belirli örüntüleri neden kullanmış olabileceklerine dair nedenler Hunston ve Francis'in Örüntü Dil Bilgisi yaklaşımına (2000) göndermeler yaparak önerildi.

Anahtar Kelimeler: İletişim Eylemleri, Öğrenci Derlemi, Aradil, Örüntü Dilbilgisi

Introduction

Interlanguage (IL), which was first developed by Selinker (1972), is a continuous development in language learner's linguistic system. The term is to be defined as the progressive linguistic system that is produced by the language learner with the influence of his/her native language and the target language. Hence, learners are expected to rely on both the dynamics of their first language and of their second language during the process as well. Namely, interlanguage is a system which has a status between the native and target languages having its own rules, system and structure. Argued by Selinker (1972), "the existence of a separate linguistic system based on the observable output which results from a learner's attempted production of a TL norm" (p. 214) forms the backbone of the theory of interlanguage. Productions by a second language learner will always be distinguishable since they will lack the capacity to reach the native-like level. Investigating those productions, particularly with the

[*] Okutman, Osmaniye Korkut Ata Üniversitesi, Kadirli MYO, fatihbozdag@osmaniye.edu.tr
[**] Okutman, Adana Bilim ve Teknoloji Üniversitesi, YDYO, nebahatbadem@gmail.com

aid of corpus linguistics, may reveal valuable insight about variables of the EFL learners of a particular language. Besides, regarding those structures produced by EFL learners, particularly in their writing systems, plenty of research may help us to examine lexical and functional categories and the features attributed to them, their semantic dimensions, pragmatics extensions and such.

It is possible to observe the peculiarities of the productions by non-native speakers (henceforth NNSs) by investigating lexical classes used by these learners. One of the many ways which help researchers to elicit these interlanguage features is to examine the verbs used by learners. Being an important lexical class in terms of conveying meaning, verbs so far have been studied from different aspects (Meunier, 2002; Tono, 2003; Housen, 2002; Ringbom, 1998; Paquot, 2010). Another aspect of these studies is to analyze verbs in learner productions according to semantic classes of these verbs suggested by Biber (2006). One of these semantic classes given by Biber is *communication verbs* in both spoken and written registers.

The study of communication verbs is a relatively new area since few studies have been encountered (Partridge, 2011; Boas, 2010). While Partridge (2011) investigated the communication verbs used by native English speakers and speakers of Setswana English, Boas (2010) conducted a study on analysis of communication verbs appearing in the ditransitive constructions in terms of Goldberg's construction grammar (1995). Briefly, communication verbs are the kind of verbs that the writer or speaker uses to present his stance by distancing himself from the truth of the proposition in order to display it as something someone else says (Biber, 2006). Additionally, these verbs "... seem to virtually quote the "original" utterance and are just like direct reporting ..." (Tirumalesh, 1999, p. 150). Thus, it is important for researchers to investigate the use of these verbs and their pattern structures as used by NSs in order to provide implications for NNSs.

Although grammar and vocabulary are thought as separate areas of language studies in traditional sense, lexical aspects to study of grammar suggest they can combine usefully. Utilizing corpus linguistics as a method of conducting linguistics research, there have been various studies investigating lexis-grammar interrelationship. Following Firth's notion of form meaning relationship in a text, Sinclair (2000), Halliday (2013), and Hoey (2005) approached their studies assuming the lexis is the pivot of grammatical descriptions. Relatively a new study to the field, pattern grammar (Hunston and Francis, 2000) in the same sense of Sinclair's (1996) studies, sets forth connection between vocabulary and grammar, form and meaning. Hunston and Francis (2000) explain as follows: "The patterns of a word can be defined as all the words and structures which are regularly associated with the word and which contribute to its meaning." (p. 37) Relying on the authentic data observed in large corpora, they propose that a pattern can be defined under the circumstances of particular words co-occurring frequently besides having a clear meaning in terms of their word choices (Hunston and Francis, 2000). Thus, patterns of a word can be explored and identified as recurrent combinations which carry their specific meanings shaped by their constructions. Additionally, unlike other lexical approaches to grammar that mostly analyze collocational nature of lexical items, pattern grammar covers wide range of other structures, specific expression and abstract syntactic frames.

Analysis of those patterns which also forms the basis ground of the current study, is handled by investigating authentic language in use. Large archive of texts in a language is able to provide typical pattern structures attributed by native speakers to an individual lexical item. Hence, corpus studies are undoubtedly utilized to define natural co-occurrence of recurrent words. Native corpora, therefore, provide a wide range of utterances from which these patterns can be recognized and exemplified while these word patterns can also be found in some learner

dictionaries (Collins Cobuild Learner Dictionary, Oxford Advanced Dictionary of Learners etc.). As stated by Hunston and Francis (2000, p. 265) "a reference grammar of patterns, then, is a resource which can be used in conjunction with other materials to increase learners' ability to recognise and use the lexicon of English." By making use of these tools, researchers can provide a solid base formed by authentic language use for language teaching. Also, language teachers can incorporate patterns into their language teaching which in turn may help learners to acquire the language in a way that they can use patterns as NSs do. Thus, this paper aims to investigate these verb patterns as used by both NSs and NNSs (Turkish EFL learners in particular) while also to provide reasons in general as to why NNSs have problems with the correct usage of these verb patterns. Finally, it will conclude by giving implications for language teaching.

Research Questions

This paper focuses on verb pattern use by Turkish EFL learners and native American university students by seeking for the answers of the following questions:

1.What communication verbs do Turkish EFL learners use in their argumentative essays?

2. To what extent are these verbs covered in the argumentative essays of Turkish EFL learners when compared to native American university students?

3. Do Turkish EFL learners show a tendency to use communication verb patterns as NSs do? If so, are the similarities/differences statistically significant?

4. Do the semantic frames of these pattern structures primed by NSs and NNSs have common/distinctive features?

Methodology

Data used in the current study were extracted from two comparable corpora; ICLEv2 and LOCNESS (Granger, Dagneaux, Meunier, Paquot, 2009). Turkish subcorpus of ICLEv2 (Kilimci, Can, 2008) is to provide learner data which covers 192,350 words token gathered from 280 argumentative essays of Turkish EFL learners whose levels vary from upper-intermediate to advanced. Argumentative essays consisting of TICLE corpus include topics such as education, environment and society. Each essay approximately covers 712 words. This corpus henceforth will be referred as TICLE, Turkish sub-corpus of ICLEv2.

As native comparable English corpus, a subcorpus of LOCNESS, consisted of argumentative essays of American university (17-23 years old) students, was selected for the sake of the study. This corpus was used as control corpus which includes 148,516 words token gathered from 175 essays written on the same topic available in ICLEv2.

Data Analysis

Corpus pattern analysis in the same fashion of Hunston and Francis (2000) was applied in this study. The focus of the investigation is on the typical syntagmatic patterns of communication verbs and on nouns with which are in use. Patterns were manually extracted from concordance lines for each top ten verbs. Additionally, grammatical correctness of patterns found in both corpora was checked from Collins Cobuild Online Learner Dictionary[*]. Finally, the same set of codes adopted from Hunston and Francis (2000) was used to codify pattern structures.

This study investigated 63 verbs of communication (see Appendix) listed by Biber (2006) on his list of *communication verbs*. First of all, all verbs on the list were searched in both

---

[*] (http://www.collinsdictionary.com/dictionary/english-cobuild-learners)

corpora and overall frequencies of verbs used in those corpora were extracted. Then raw frequencies were normalized per 1 million due to significant differences in number of token of both corpora. Based on those variables, overall coverage of those verbs was estimated along with type/token ratios and overall usage profile. Then top ten verbs in both corpora were listed as well as ranks of individual verbs in other corpus.

Additionally, pattern analysis was applied to those selected two of top ten verbs used in TICLE in comparison of their frequencies to LOCNESS. Due to limitation of placement in the study, this paper handles analysis of two out of top ten communication verbs. Those two verbs *mention* and *offer* were selected because of their significant usage profile outlined by Turkish EFL learners. In addition to investigating relative uses and pattern structures, semantic frames of nouns collocated with the two selected verbs regardless of their pattern structures were analyzed in both corpora. Loglikelihood (henceforth LL) calculations were also conducted to define significance values of over and under uses.

For the purpose of this study, Sketchengine (Kilgarriff, Rychly, Smrz and Tugwell, 2004, p.105-116) (www.sketchengine.com) was utilized to elicit frequencies and patterns while Wmatrix (Rayson, 2008) to extract semantic frames of nouns included in the patterns of the verbs selected.

Overall Frequency Analysis

Table 1 below shows overall raw frequency of communication verbs used in both corpora, numbers of verbs used and type / token ratios for both corpora.

Table 1: Overall type / token frequencies and ratios across both corpora

	TICLE	LOCNESS
Number of word tokens	199,350	148,516
Number of com-verbs used	54	55
Overall frequency of com-verbs used	1124	1122
Ratio of com-verbs to total number of tokens	%0.56	%0.75
Ratio of com-verbs to overall verbs used	%4.79	%6.11
Type / token ratio	0.48	0.49

Number of communication verbs used in TICLE is 54 out of 63 while it is 55 in LOCNESS, and overall frequency of communication verbs in TICLE is 1124 and in LOCNESS 1122. Additionally, 3 levels of statistics were applied for the sake of analysis. First of all, as seen on Table 1 above overall ratio of communication verbs to total number of tokens (%0.56 TICLE, %0.75 LOCNESS) was calculated. Secondly, ratio of communication verbs to overall number of token of all verbs (%4.79 TICLE, %6.11 LOCNESS) was calculated. Finally type /

token ratios calculated are (TICLE = 0.048) and (LOCNESS = 0.049). Data analysis shows that American university students use communication verbs in their argumentative essays more than Turkish EFL learners. Furthermore, ratio value for overall coverage of communication verbs to total token of verbs used is higher in LOCNESS verifying previous result. Lastly, difference in TTR values, though it is not significant, show that Turkish EFL learners rely on more repetitive use of communication verbs.

Table 2: Loglikelihood result for frequencies on Table 1

	TICLE (O1)	%1	LOCNESS (O2)	%2	LL
Overall verbs	1124	0.56	1122	0.76	-47.89

Legend: O1 is observed frequency in TICLE, O2 is observed frequency in LOCNESS, %1 and %2 values show relative frequencies in the texts. + indicates overuse in O1 relative to O2, - indicates underuse in O1 relative to O2.

Though TTR calculations report close values when two corpora compared, LL result calculated for those frequencies (p = - 47.89, p <0.05) displays significance underuse of communication verbs by Turkish EFL learners compared to native speakers of English. Thus, it is to be assumed that although their significant underuse in TICLE compared to LOCNESS, number of types of communication verbs in both corpora is close in numbers. Turkish EFL learners display almost similar range of choices in numbers to American university students in their use of communication verbs. Also, those findings are verified by the analysis of top ten communication verbs used in both corpora.

Table 3: Top ten communication verbs in both corpora

TICLE	n	%	Rank	LOCNESS	n	%	Rank
teach	152	13.52	(3)	state	120	10.69	(13)
ask	99	8.80	(7)	argue	90	8.02	(11)
talk	79	7.02	(11)	teach	75	6.68	(1)
mention	79	7.02	(21)	tell	65	5.79	(5)
tell	64	5.69	(4)	write	62	5.52	(6)
write	61	5.42	(5)	call	56	4.99	(10)
discuss	61	5.42	(10)	ask	56	4.99	(2)
speak	59	5.24	(8)	speak	45	4.01	(8)

| claim | 54 | 4.80 | (12) | offer | 41 | 3.65 | (22) |
| call | 52 | 4.62 | (6) | discuss | 41 | 3.65 | (7) |

Legend: n: raw frequency count of verbs, %: ratio of frequency count of an individual communication verb to overall frequency of those verbs used, ( ) the bracketed number: the verb's rank in the other corpus

Table 3 shows top ten communication verbs used in both corpora, their distributional percentages and their ranks in opposite corpora as well. As shown on Table 3, despite their ranks, seven out of top ten communication verbs are identical in both corpora. Hence it can be concluded that Turkish EFL learners almost rely on the same verbs of communication in their argumentative essays. Those finding also show consistency to type / token ratios.

Based on the data represented on Table 3, Turkish EFL learners stated overuse of communication verb *mention* which is ranked 3rd in TICLE while it is ranked 21st in LOCNESS. Also LL results (p = 29.06, p < 0.05) verify significance of overuse.

Table 4: Loglikelihood result of the communication verb *mention*

	TICLE (O1)	%1	LOCNESS(O2)	%2	LL
mention	79	0.04	16	0.01	+ 29.06

Legend: O1 is observed frequency in TICLE, O2 is observed frequency in LOCNESS, %1 and %2 values show relative frequencies in the texts. + indicates overuse in O1 relative to O2, - indicates underuse in O1 relative to O2.

Table 3 indicates underuse of communication verb *offer* by Turkish EFL learners. Communication verb *offer* is ranked 9th in LOCNESS while it is ranked 22nd in TICLE. LL result (p=30.45, p<0.05) was calculated to display significance of underuse.

Table 5: Loglikelihood result of the communication verb offer

	TICLE (O1)	%1	LOCNESS(O2)	%2	LL
offer	10	0.01	41	0.03	- 30.45

Legend: O1 is observed frequency in TICLE, O2 is observed frequency in LOCNESS, %1 and %2 values show relative frequencies in the texts. + indicates overuse in O1 relative to O2, - indicates underuse in O1 relative to O2.

Further analysis was applied to investigate similarities / differences in patterns structures of the two selected communication verbs; *mention* which is significantly overused and *offer* which significantly underused in TICLE compared to LOCNESS. Additionally, regardless of patterns they participated in, semantic frames of nouns collocated with those two verbs were examined.

Analysis of Pattern Structures

This section includes the analysis of pattern structures of verbs on Table 3. Patterns of two verbs, namely *mention* and *offer*, out of top ten verbs in TICLE were selected in order to

elicit similarities and differences of patterns as used by both Turkish EFL learners and American university students. Additional data were supplied to support findings.

The Verb "Mention" and Its Patterns

The verb *mention* is ranked third in TICLE while it is ranked twenty first in LOCNESS. LL result ($p = +29.06$, $p < 0.05$) calculated for frequencies on Table 4 indicates overall significant overuse of the verb *mention* by Turkish EFL learners. However, apart from significant overuse by Turkish EFL learners, pattern analysis indicates distinctive use of patterns of the verb *mention* in TICLE and LOCNESS.

Table 6: Patterns of the verb *mention* found in TICLE, their raw frequencies and ratio in both corpora

Patterns	TICLE n	%	LOCNESS n	%
be V-ed	16	%20.51	6	%42.85
V n/V-ing	6	%7.69	2	%14.28
V that	1	%1.28	2	%14.28
be V-ed as	1	%1.28	-	-
*V ungrammatical patterns	54	%69.23	4	%28.57

Legend: The upper-case V (verb group) indicates that this is the word-class whose patterns we are focusing on. v: verb group, n: noun group, adj: adjective group, adv: adverb group, that: clause introduced by that (realised or not), -ing: clause introduced by an '-ing' form, to-inf: clause introduced, by a to-infinitive form, wh: clause introduced by a wh-word (including how), pp: clause introduced by a preposition, v-ed: passive structures. Asterisk *: ungrammatical pattern structures. % ratio of frequency count of an individual pattern to overall frequency of patterns used.

Detailed analysis of significantly overused communication verb *mention* reveals interesting results. As it can be seen on Table 6, *be V-ed* structure is the most frequent pattern in both corpora. Additionally, using verbal item alone as a pattern does not exist in LOCNESS. Secondly, pattern *V n/V-ing* is preferred by Turkish EFL learners. Finally other grammatical patterns found in TICLE are *V that* and *be V-ed as* structures.

However most interesting fact in the analysis is, as indicated by frequency analysis and % ratio result (n=54, %69.23), the use of the verb selected in marked pattern constructions. Marked patterns by Turkish EFL learners include particularly *V about*, *V* and *V to* which are also according to Collins Cobuild Dictionary are all ungrammatical patterns of the verb *mention.* Hence it can be assumed that Turkish EFL learners incline heavily towards using those marked patterns of the verb *mention* in their argumentative essays which is presumably due to Turkish EFL learners' transfer syntactic constrains of the verb *mention* from L1 lexicon to L2 lexicon or incorrect overgeneralization of shared semantic and syntactic attributes of

synonymous verbs. Additionally, another distinctive use of the communication verb *mention* in TICLE is as discourse marker that consists of *As pronoun V* construction.

Semantic Frames of Nouns Collocated with the Communication Verb "Mention"

Apart from overall frequency and patterns analysis, this section reports semantic frames of nouns as direct object of the verb. Due to main purpose of the study and limitation of placement, individual analysis of nouns within patterns are disregarded and instead, overall nouns "in brackets" and their semantic frames "in bold" were investigated to analyze semantic preferences in both corpora.

List 1 below shows common semantic frames and nouns within these frames in both corpora:

Shared nouns and their semantic frames in TICLE as follows: **Cause&Effect/Connection** (reason, effect, factor), **Difficult** (problem), **General appearance and physical properties** (balance, feature), **Education in general** (study).

Shared nouns and their semantic frames in LOCNESS as follows: **Cause&Effect/Connection** (consequence, reason), **Difficult** (problem), **General appearance and physical properties** (circumstance), **Education in general** (education).

Hearst (1992) states that surface patterns can signify clue to consistent semantic relations among co-occurrence in authentic text. Furthermore, indicating each word is introspectively primed, Hoey (2005, p.8) asserts that " a word is acquired through encounters with it in speech and writing … and our knowledge of it includes the fact that it co-occurs with certain other words in certain kind of texts."

Presumably due to variations in essay topics covered in both corpora, shared lexical semantic frames of the communication verb *mention* across corpora are low in number. Hoey (2005, p. 186) points that "priming come not from frequent, necessarily unordered encounters but from a single focused and generalizing encounter". Regardless of their frequencies, List 1 shows identical and synonymous common nouns primed with the verb in both corpora. Despite low frequency counts of individual nouns and shared semantic frames, List 1 displays resemblance across TICLE and LOCNESS.

Following List 2 displays distinctive nouns "in brackets" primed with the communication verb *mention* and their semantic frames "in bold" in both corpora.

Distinctive nouns and their semantic frames used in TICLE as follows; **Work and employment: Generally** (worker), **Trying hard** (struggle), **Time: Period** (day), **Thought, belief** (invention), **Sports and games generally** (score), **Probability** (probability), **People** (person), **Money and pay** (payment), **Hindering** (obstacle), **Generally kinds, groups, examples** (case), **Expected** (expectation), **Constraint** (limitation), **Comparing: Different** (inequality), **Anatomy and physiology** (cell).

Distinctive nouns and their semantic frames used in LOCNESS as follows; **Time** (time), **The Media: Newspapers etc** (article), **Mental object: Means, method** (style), **Information technology and computing** (program), **General actions / making** (cut), **Distance: Near** (neighbourhood), **Architecture, houses and buildings** (architect).

Though they are small in number due to Turkish EFL learners' peculiar tendency to use the verb in discourse marker constructions, list of extracted nouns and their semantic frames provide relevant result. Hoey (2005, p. 81) states referring to Sinclair (1987) "a distinctive

collocational or collocational pattern indicates a separate use of the word." In this sense, though majority of patterns of this verb as used by Turkish EFL learners share an ungrammatical structure, influenced by interlanguage development, their common use of distinctive ungrammatical patterns and primed nouns with those pattern may carry peculiar sense. A detailed contrastive analysis is therefore crucial to describe developmental interlanguage features and deviations which exceeds the scope of the current study.

The Verb "Offer" and Its Patterns

As seen on Table 3, based on raw frequnecy count of individual verbs, the communication verb *offer* is ranked 9th in LOCNESS, however it is ranked 22nd reporting underuse profile. Furthermore, LL result (p= - 30.45, p<0.05) as seen on Table 5 argues overall underuse of verb by Turkish EFL learners. Due to low frequency count, pattern structures of the verb do not reveal variation density, however it is crucial to express preferred patterns used in TICLE.

Table 7: Patterns of the verb *offer* found in TICLE, their raw frequencies and ratio in both corpora

Patterns	TICLE n	%	LOCNESS n	%
V n	3	%30	13	%81.25
V n n	3	%30	1	%6.25
V n pp(to)	2	%20	2	%12.5
Ungrammatical	2	%20	-	

Legend: The upper-case V (verb group) indicates that this is the word-class whose patterns we are focusing on. v: verb group, n: noun group, adj: adjective group, adv: adverb group, that: clause introduced by that (realised or not), -ing: clause introduced by an '-ing' form, to-inf: clause introduced, by a to-infinitive form, wh: clause introduced by a wh-word (including how), pp: clause introduced by a preposition, v-ed: passive structures. Asterisk *: ungrammatical pattern structures. % ratio of frequency count of an individual pattern to overall frequency of patterns used.

As it can be seen on Table 7 communication verb *offer* is used with patterns *V n*, *V n n* and *V n to(pp)*. Despite their low frequencies, primed patterns are consistent with the patterns used in LOCNESS. These patterns are verb followed by a noun group.

As stated earlier, as a result of low frequency count of the verb in TICLE, pattern analysis of the communication verb *offer* shows only limited sense to outline generalizations. However, detailed search in corpus TICLE revealed that, instead of communication verb *offer* Turkish EFL learners prefer using synonymous non-communication verbs with identical patterns such as *suggest* (n=22), *afford* (n=18), *present* (n=22) and with almost similar patterns with a few additions *provide* (n=115). Furthermore, same analysis in LOCNESS display similar results. American university students use synonymous non-communication verbs with identical patterns *provide* (n=81) and *suggest* (n=20). These findings show consistency with the basic implication of pattern grammar approach. Verbs or patterns that share similar or identical semantic constraints also show consistency in their syntactic structures. Thus, it can be

concluded that though communication verb *offer* was significantly underused by Turkish EFL learners, they are able to use non-communication verbs with common semantic sense and syntactic constrains with grammatical pattern.

Semantic Frames of Nouns Collocated with the Communication Verb "Offer"

Across both corpora there is only one shared semantic frame ***Helping*** with nouns in LOCNESS (*support, counselling*) and with noun (*aid)* in TICLE. List 3 which shows distinctive nouns and semantic frames below:

Distinctive nouns and their semantic frames used in LOCNESS as follows: **Cause&effect/Connection** (reason,excuse), **Work and employment: Generally** (job), **Thought, belief** (opinion), **Sports** (sport), **Speech: Communicative** (argument), **Money generally** (money), **Money and pay** (pay), **Mental object: Means, method** (method), **Medicines and medical treatment** (abortion), **Measurement: General** (statistics), **Lawful** (justice), **Language, speech and grammar** (word), **Knowledgeable** (experience), **Kin** (divorce), **Food** (food), **Evaluation: True** (fact), **Evaluation: Good** (advantage), **Entertainment generally** (entertainment), **Alive** (life).

Distinctive nouns and their semantic frames used in TICLE as follows: **Wanted** (choice,strategies), **Speech acts** (suggestion), **Politics** (demonstration), **People: Female** (women), **Location and direction** (centre), **Education in general** (education), **Belonging to a group** (community).

As it can be seen on List 3, set of semantic frames primed by American university students and Turkish EFL learners are quite varied when they are compared. This may be due to Turkish EFL learners encountering selected verbs collocated with a limited set of nouns of nouns within limited semantic frames. Additionally, it may be claimed that Turkish EFL learners lack of exposure to authentic language resulted in marked interlanguage feature, producing non-native like structures.

Nevertheless, according to pattern grammar, nouns or semantic frames primed with patterns which are common in both corpora are expected to show consistency. However, as indicated by results, particularly neither nouns nor their semantic frames state resemblance. Hence it can be concluded that, Turkish EFL learners within the given context, prefer priming nouns with verbs of communication as quite diverse compared to American university students.

Hoey (2005) states priming of lexical items as a result of an individual's personal experiences. In this sense, priming effects in language learning settings are to be assumed due to learners encounter of an individual word with an other item within a specific register or genre. Hence comparing primed lexical items, nouns for the current study, is expected to give clues about learner's lexical variation or their encounters to authentic data. As they are exposed to authentic utterances of second language thus, they are to prime similar lexical item or lexical items with similar semantic frames. Additionally, Francis and Hunston (2000) claim that use of patterns by second language learners are to indicate state of nativelikeness of those learners. When both approaches were taken into consideration with the results given in the study, supposedly it is claimed that Turkish EFL learners do not resemble native-like status in their use of communication verbs.

Discussion and Conclusions

First of all, this study confirms that Turkish EFL learners use the communication verbs suggested by Biber (2006) in their argumentative essays. Analysis results show that argumentative essays written by Turkish EFL learners do not include as many communication verbs as essays written by American university students. Moreover, the statistical data also

shows that the underuse of these verbs presents significance when compared. However, numbers of types and type token ratio results are close in number across both corpora. 7 out of 10 most frequently used communication verbs are the same in both corpora. Thus, it is concluded that Turkish EFL learners rely on identical communication verbs in their essays to most extent. In addition, when analyzed in terms of overuse and underuse phenomenon, data shows that the verb *mention* is overused while the verb *offer* is underused in TICLE. In depth analysis signifies that differences between use of those verbs in terms of patterns structures and primed nouns within them, as stated above, primarily may result from the transfer effect from L1 as well as the overgeneralization of the patterns of synonyms verbs. This also indicate interlanguage markedness relying on using peculiar patterns. In the case of interlanguage development, Selinker (1972) also suggest (a) language transfer, (b) transfer of training, (c) strategies of second language learning, (d) strategies of second language communication and (e) overgeneralization of TL linguistic material as reasons for this potential failure. As for the underuse verb *offer*, it is suggested that Turkish EFL learners have a tendency to use the verbs sharing a similar meaning instead of *offer*. Despite of not being communication verbs, these synonyms verbs may have been used for compensatory purposes.

The implications of this study for second language teaching can be summarised as follows; First, it can be seen that the conscious knowledge of the pattern use can contribute enormously to a learner's interlanguage development. As stated also by Willis (2003, p. 149), "in order to use language fluently and quickly learners need to assimilate not just words but patterns...". Secondly, it is assumed that each lexical item carries its syntactic, semantic and pragmatic information on it. Thus, it is important for the learner to know which verb as well as other lexical items co-occur with that verb, to be used in which context Language teachers can make use of awareness raising in order to help their students to acquire the structures in a native like fashion during their acquisition so that they can use these appropriately later on. Secondly, being an invaluable resource for both language teachers and learners, corpus can be incorporated into language teaching classes to present authentic language use to learners instead of providing them with made-up, repetitive exercises.

Finally, limitations of the study are as follows; Though topics covered in both corpora are alike, both learners and native speakers choice of lexical items and patterns as both primings and use of patterns are assumed to be idiosyncratic and context depended. TICLE is the largest learner corpus of Turkish EFL learners available. However a larger corpus may provide detailed data for lexical range and pattern variations thus, aiding detailed analysis of each pattern individually. Therefore providing more data to foreground claims about interlanguage of Turkish EFL learners.

References

Babanoğlu, M. P. (2012). A corpus-based study on Turkish EFL learners' written English: The use of adverbial connectors by Turkish learners. *Unpublished doctoral thesis. Çukurova University, Adana-Turkey*.

Biber, D. (2006). *University language: A corpus-based study of spoken and written registers* (Vol. 23). John Benjamins Publishing. doi:10.1075/scl.23

Boas, H. C. (2010). The syntax–lexicon continuum in Construction Grammar: A case study of English communication verbs. *Belgian Journal of Linguistics*, *24*(1), 54-82.

Dictionary, C. E. (2009). London: Collins, 2000. Credo Reference [online)[retrieved on Jul. 30, 2009], available at.

Dictionary, O. E. (2007). Oxford English dictionary online.

Goldberg, A. E. (1995). Constructions: A construction grammar approach to argument structure. University of Chicago Press.

Granger, S., Dagneaux, E., Meunier, F., & Paquot, M. (Eds.). (2009). International corpus of learner English.

Halliday, M. A. (1994). Functional grammar. *London: Edward Arnold*.

Hearst, M. A. (1992, August). Automatic acquisition of hyponyms from large text corpora. In *Proceedings of the 14th conference on Computational linguistics-Volume 2* (pp. 539-545). Association for Computational Linguistics. doi:10.3115/992133.992154

Hoey, M. (2005). *Lexical priming: A new theory of words and language*. Psychology Press. doi:10.1057/9781137440037.0008

Holtz, M. (2011). Lexico-grammatical properties of abstracts and research articles. A corpus-based study of scientific discourse from multiple disciplines(Doctoral dissertation, Technische Universität).

Hornby, A. S. (1975). *Guide to patterns and usage in English*. Oxford Univ Pr.

Housen, A. (2002). A corpus-based study of the L2-acquisition of the English verb system. *Computer learner corpora, second language acquisition and foreign language teaching*, *6*, 2002-77. doi:10.1075/lllt.6.08hou

Hunston, S., & Francis, G. (2000). Pattern Grammar: A Corpus-Driven Approach to the Lexical Grammar of English. *Computational Linguistics*, *27*(2). doi:10.1075/scl.4

Kilgarriff, A., Rychly, P., Smrz, P., & Tugwell, D. (2004). Itri-04-08 the sketch engine. *Information Technology*, *105*, 116.

Kilimci, A., Can, C. (2008). TICLE: Uluslararası Türk Öğrenici İngilizcesi Derlemi.In M. Sarıca, N. Sarıca, A. Karaca, (Eds.), XXIInd Ulusal Dilbilim Kurultayı Bildirileri. Paper presented at the XXIInd Ulusal Dilbilim Kurultayı,Yüzüncü Yıl Üniversitesi, Van, 8-9 May (pp 1-11). Ankara: Yüzüncü Yıl Üniversitesi.

Louw, B. (1993). Irony in the text or insincerity in the writer? The diagnostic potential of semantic prosodies. *Text and technology: In honour of John Sinclair*, *240*, 251.

Luna, R. M. (2010). Interlanguage in Undergraduates' Academic English: Preliminary Results from Written Script Analysis. *Online Submission*, *19*, 60-73.

Meunier, F. (2002). The pedagogical value 0f native and learner corpora in EFL grammar teaching. *Computer learner corpora, second language acquisition and foreign language teaching*, *6*, 119. doi:10.1075/lllt.6.10meu

Paquot, M. (2010). Academic vocabulary in learner writing: From extraction to analysis. Bloomsbury Publishing.

Partridge, M. (2011). A comparison of lexical specificity in the communication verbs of L1 English and TE student writing 1. *Southern African Linguistics and Applied Language Studies*, *29*(2), 135-147.

Rayson, P. (2008). Wmatrix: a web-based corpus processing environment: Computing Department. *Lancaster University*.

Ringbom, H. (1998). High-frequency verbs in the ICLE corpus. *LANGUAGE AND COMPUTERS*, *23*, 191-200.

Selinker, L. (1972). Interlanguage. IRAL-International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching, 10(1-4), 209-232.

Sinclair, J. (1996). The search for units of meaning. *Textus online only. 9 (1996), N. 1, 1996*, *9*(1), 1000-1032.

Sinclair, J. (2000). Lexical grammar. *Naujoji Metodologija*, *24*, 191-203.

Tirumalesh, K. V. (1999). Grammar and communication: Essays on the form and function of language (Vol. 6). Allied Publishers.

Tono, Y. (2003). Corpus wo Eigo Kyoiku ni Ikasu [What corpora can do for language teaching]. *English Corpus Studies*, *10*, 249-264.

Willis, D. (2003). Rules, patterns and words: Grammar and lexis in English language teaching. Ernst Klett Sprachen.

Appendix

The list of communication verbs as extracted from Biber (2006, p. 247):

Communication verbs: 'a special subcategory of activity verbs that involve communication activities (speaking, writing)' (LGSWE, pp. 362, 368, 370):

say, tell, call, ask, write, talk, speak, thank, descibe, claim, offer, admit, announce, answer, argue,deny, discuss, encourage, explain, express, insist, mention, offer, propose, quote, reply, shout, sign,sing, state, teach, warn, accuse, acknowledge, address, advise, appeal, assure, challenge, complain, consult, convince, declare, demand, emphasize, excuse, inform, invite, persuade, phone, pray, promise, question, recommend, remark, respond, specify, swear, threaten, urge, welcome, whisper, suggest